DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 345 958 SO 021 583

AUTHOR Wahlstrom, Riitta
TITLE Peace Education Meets the Challenge of the Cultures of Militarism. Peace Education Miniprints No. 11.
INSTITUTION Lund Univ. (Sweden). Malmo School of Education.
REPORT NO ISSN-1101-6418
PUB DATE Mar 91
NOTE 24p.
AVAILABLE FROM Department of Educational and Psychological Research, Malmo School of Education, Box 23501, S-200 45, Malmo, Sweden.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cultural Influences; *Educational Objectives; Foreign Countries; International Cooperation; *Peace; Role of Education; Violence; *War; World Affairs
IDENTIFIERS *Militarism; *Peace Education

ABSTRACT

The militaristic culture serves to imprison many of the world's peoples, and most persons are not even aware of the harmful limitations that this culture's emphasis on military preparedness, violence, and the use of force in international relations places on all humans. This paper discusses various characteristics of militarism, and peace education that has as some of its aims the conversion of cultures of militarism to cultures of peace, authoritarian education to democratic education, sexism to supporting equality between men and women, obedience and uniformity to supporting self-reliance, independence, and critical thinking and racism and nationalism to tolerance and global responsibility. A 39-item list of references is included. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

PEACE EDUCATION MEETS THE CHALLENGE OF THE CULTURES OF MILITARISM

Riitta Wahlström

"We are imprisoned by our culture. The militaristic culture is one of the most dreadful cultures in the world, but we do not even know how our prison looks and we cannot even shake the bars, because we do not see them." From this starting-point Riitta Wahlström, peace educator from Finland, discusses various characteristics of militarism as well as peace education as an instrument of conversion from cultures of militarism to cultures of peace, from authoritarian education to democratic education, and from extreme nationalism to tolerance and global responsibility. The Seville Statement on Violence is included as an appendix. – The text is reprinted from "Peace, Environment and Education", 1991, 2(1), 13-32.

PEACE EDUCATION MEETS THE CHALLENGE OF THE CULTURES OF MILITARISM

Riitta Wahlström

Institute for Educational Research
University of Jyväskylä, P.O. Box 35
SF-40351 Jyväskylä, Finland

Introduction

We are imprisoned by our culture. The militaristic culture is one of the most dreadful cultures in the world, but we do not even know how our prison looks and we cannot even shake the bars, because we do not see them.

Skolimowski (1987, p. 39) says that nearly all present cultures are sick. The name of this sickness is atrophy of values. Consumerism and militarism are the sick values of most societies. Peace education is one of the lines of thought which try to break the value and power structures of militaristic culture in society.

In militaristic culture military institutions force their way too much into the area of civil institutions and the result is that individual liberties and the possibilities of democratic decision-making decrease. The Encyclopedia Americana (1975, p. 59) defines militarism as follows: "Militarism is applied to the policy of giving exceptional emphasis to military preparedness, exalting military virtues and relying on force in international relations. Preparation for war encourages the growth of the militaristic spirit to strengthen the combatants for battle". Militarism is characterized by nationalism, political conservatism, authoritarianism, a pessimistic conception of human nature and alarmism in estimating the probability of war.

Lumsden (1977) states that the primary role of the military is to maintain the present world economic order, an order which is characterized, on one hand, by global competition between competing industrial systems, and on the other hand, by vast discrepancies in the utilization of resources.

The militarism of today has grown on to the economic-political-technological system. It no longer contains open idealization of war, war fanaticism or uncritical admiration of the military institution, but the arms

race has become more global. Armies are not only permanent, but they are also always ready for combat, and armament has a legitimate and respected status. Militarism still affects the economy, politics and ecology of the world. At present militarism cannot be distinguished as easily as before. It is difficult to find ideological militarism, even though the military readiness is very high at the moment and most countries still rely on military solutions in their politics. The traditional Clausewitzian thinking lives in several Third World countries, where various minority groups fight for their human rights. "Clausewitz views war as a rational instrument of national policy and he defines war: War is an act of violence intended to compel our opponent to fulfil our will." (Rapaport, 1968, p. 13-14). International weapon marketing supports all mechanisms which lead to war.

The policy of the oppressive ruling groups is being influenced by complex cultural-historical factors and by the infiltration of armament industries and the arms trade into political decision-making. Structural violence is an essential underlying factor of war. Øberg (1981) writes that disarmament cannot be addressed without giving analytic attention to the symbiotic relationship between armament and structural violence.

The Cultures of Militarism; Myths, Symbols and Images of Human Beings

The cultures of militarism promote war and armament. As Häyrynen (1985) states, the cultural armament which utilizes art, education and mass communication creates a basis for war, which is violence organized by society. The reality of war, which is unnatural to human nature, can not be created without cultural and educational manipulation. Luckham (1984) even uses the term 'armament culture'. Arms modify human consciousness through a phenomenon which we can call armament culture. According to Luckham, armament has a deep effect on all forms of culture. Science and technology and even the language which is used in everyday life are militarized (Chilton, 1986).

Weapons are mythicized to represent force, scientific progress and the exercise of power. In cultural production they are marketed in the form of war toys and video games, and even as thrillers or movies based on violence. Luckham (1984, p. 2-3) writes that weapons have become myths of power. Weapons are named Eagle, Tornado, Tor, Atlas etc, taking the use of

traditional images of power and strength. Militaristic culture is truly global and hegemonic. All over the world there are military parades, rituals, marches, heroes with guns etc. Often this language is filled with sexual metaphors (see Easlea, 1983). Myths, symbols, and even totems play a considerable role in the military subcultures. The main function of the military rituals and symbolism is the strengthening of group solidarity, which often takes place at the expense of solidarity with civilian populations. Since one is striving to strengthen the solidarity of males, the misogynist language functions well for this purpose (Brock-Utne, 1990).

Human beings act not only on the basis of what they believe is probable (cognitive aspect) but also on the basis of what is believed to be desirable (affective aspect). In social interactions therefore, the main function of militaristic mythology is not so much to explain why things exist but rather to reinforce ingroup identification and create the image of a possible threat. The manipulation of uncertainty and associated anxiety and the reinforcement of group solidarity are the two social functions of mythology which are important to study in militarism. Human beings are willing to pay those who can reduce uncertainty for them.

The typical features of militaristic culture are ethnocentrism, belief in authority, nationalism and a pessimistic conception of human nature (Luckham, 1984; Wahlström, 1983).

Betty Reardon (1985, p. 14) states: "Militarism is a belief system founded on the basic assumption that human beings are by nature violent, aggressive and competitive and on the corollary assumption that social order must be maintained by force and power". The image - human being as by nature evil, violent and competitive - leads logically to the conclusion that security and social order can be maintained only by power and coercive means. Häyrynen (1985) states that most of the arguments, according to which war is a necessity, contain mystification of human nature ("War cannot be avoided, because human beings are what they are", "war is a part of human nature" and other statements of the same kind). Thus, the conception of "human" maintained by militarism is connected with the idea that war is accepted as a necessity, as an eternal plague. According to Lagerspetz (1984), this view has been presented often in many popular writings. In *The Making of Mankind* (1981, p. 219) Leakey remarks that the common idea that violence is innate in human beings is one of the most dangerous and destructive ideas that mankind has ever had. Our beliefs influence what we do.

However, warfare is not genetically programmed, but it is learned

behaviour (Leakey 1981. See also App. 1: The Seville Statement on Violence, approved by Unesco). The purpose of peace education is to "free" people of such beliefs which support the maintaining of militarism.

Militarism And Sexism

Betty Reardon (1985, p. 4) finds that because there is a symbiotic relationship between armaments and structural violence it is impossible to separate politically the problems of militarization from those of poverty and oppression, and this provides a precedent and a paradigm for consideration of the kind of relationship that exists between sexism and the war system. Militarism is based on patriarchalism and sexism. Patriarchy is a set of beliefs and values supported by institutions and backed by the threat of violence. It lays down the supposedly "proper" relations between men and women, between women and women and between men and men. - Men in most societies are taught very early to be "masculine", to respect only other men who are "masculine", to compete with each other, to hide their fears and compassion from one another, to treat their sons differently than they treat their daughters (Brock-Utne, 1985; Brock-Utne, 1989). The military is the distilled embodiment of patriarchy (Reardon, 1985, p.15).

The belief that men are superior to women is typical sexist thinking. Sexism humiliates women. Military training underlines openly that women are inferior to men. This kind of belief system makes it easier for men to abandon their women and wives and to rape and humiliate women during war. In military training young men learn to underestimate women, and they learn to oppress and violate their own needs. The education for equality between women and men is a threat to militarism. This education teaches men to respect women and to adopt their set of values. The women's set of values is opposed to the militaristic way of thinking, to the emphasizing of power, competition and violence. The typical image of male in the Euro-American culture underlines toughness and machomasculinity. The education for equality alters this image of male. When fathers start to take care of their children more often and function as affectionate objects of identification, the macho male image breaks. The sexist culture and the closely associated militarism weaken when fatherhood becomes culturally and psychologically equal with motherhood. It can be assumed that the equality of parental roles in the family will decrease sexism in the culture as well.

The feminine values which nurture life, and acknowledge the need for transcending competition and violence, are needed to guide policy formation to avoid and abolish war (Brock-Utne, 1985; Reardon, 1985; Kekkonen, 1986). It is a task, though, for both males and females to get rid of militarism. The same values - nurturing life, caring and sharing - exist in masculine culture, and on the other hand competition, desire for power exist in feminine culture.

Militarism Creates Enemy Image

To legitimize the maintenance of a vast military establishment in peacetime, great efforts are made to exploit news items which create public anxiety about the intentions of a possible enemy. The militaristic conception of the human being, which emphasizes violence and competitiveness, legitimizes the idea that in principle, there always exists an enemy, which might attack. According to Igliztin (1978, p. 4), supranational militarism always portrays the enemy as an anonymous object, which is continuously present. The enemy can be another nation, an ethnic, ideological or religious group within one's own community or people of different races or language groups. The existence of an enemy justifies the use of violence. In war the fighting troops become enemies to each other, and so to protect one's own life one "has to kill". In peacetime the maintenance of enemy images is dangerous preparation for war and for the true outbreak of hostilities.

The concept of enemy images is very familiar to war propaganda. Lasswell (1927) writes that if you want to arouse a nation against an enemy, describe the enemy as a threatening and murderous attacker, portray the enemy as an obstacle to the ideals and dreams cherished by the nation and each of its central group (ref. Luostarinen, 1986, p. 32).

Both the attitude and the behaviour towards an enemy are violent. The enemy is believed to threaten everything that is regarded good and valuable in the national identity. The formation of enemy images is characterized by dualistic thinking. This kind of thinking induces people to view different kinds of morals, values, ideologies and religions either "right" or "wrong" and people either "good" or bad". The present author (Wahlström, 1986, 1987, 1989) has described the enemy image as a psychological phenomenon: the enemy image is the commonly-held, stereotyped, dehumanized image of the outgroup. The enemy image provides a focus for externalization of fears and

threats. In addition a lot of undesirable cognitions and emotions are projected onto the enemy. This definition contains three important points: the enemy image is connected with an outgroup, dehumanization of the enemy legitimizes violence, and the enemy image provides a focus for projections.

The enemy image has a scapegoat function; weaknesses and failures are transferred to an external target and thus one's own identity and/or that of the nation is protected (Volkan, 1985). The enemy is blamed for the failures of domestic policies. The enemy always becomes the embodiment of what we fear or reject in ourselves. The enemy is always other, and feared. Society reinforces and exaggerates this perception of otherness. "Othering" is one of those psychological mechanisms to separate people into better and worse, good or bad etc. Both sexist society and the war system are kept in order by the capacity to use or threaten the use of violence against those "others" (Reardon, 1985, p. 7).

The central element in the forming of the enemy image is the dehumanization of the enemy. This dehumanization process involves the removal of all human facets. It can be observed in various forms in military training and in the arousal of nations against their enemies. The dehumanization of the enemy is clearly seen in the cruelties which happen in many internal conflicts. Savage murders, torturing and killing of unarmed children and women are related to the view of seeing victims as dehumanized enemies. For example, many internal conflicts are characterized by the killing of helpless women and children and not only real enemies with weapons. The mental image of seeing somebody as an enemy makes the cruelty possible. Otherness, in its negative form, connotes hierarchies in human worth, the fundamental assumption that makes possible dehumanization of the other sex, another race, class, citizens of another state, or adherents to another religion or ideology.

Images which are connected to our emotions and values are quite powerful. Emotional reasoning is part of the image world of the human mind. Fear, hate and feelings of being threatened, humiliated, worthless and powerless are ingredients in the emotional reasoning related to the development of enemy images.

The mass media and propagandistic brainwashing have a very important role in creating the enemy image. Propagandistic brainwashing is an essential part of a militaristic culture. Militarism supports the creation of the enemy image in all possible ways, e.g. by utilizing rumors, mass media and propaganda.

The Power Structure And Education for A Militaristic Culture

Militarism is promoted by organizational forms in which orders are obeyed without questioning them and actions are carried out without knowledge of their purposes. Militarism is connected to patriarchal society. Patriarchy is, according to French (1986, p. 429), a doctrine which rests on the assumption that the human being is superior to animal. This superiority is based on the human being's relation to the higher power/knowledge, which is called God, reason or ability to govern. The human being has created a substitute environment, where he does not seem to be dependent on nature anymore (ibid., p. 429-430).

The education to promote militaristic culture reflects the power structure and the patriarchal set of values. Educational institutions and methods are characterized be authoritarianism, hierarchism, discipline and submission to the power of the one who is stronger and higher up in the hierarchical structure. Both men and women teach children to worship, serve and fear the powerful. Women's part in this teaching process is important. Mothers are said to instill in their offspring the idea that fame, power and prestige lead to happiness (Pacheco, 1987, p. 112).

Militaristic education tolerates neither creative curiosity nor speculative attitudes. Critical attitudes are forbidden, rules and regulations are to be followed without criticism and questioning. Equality is impossible in a militaristic culture. Hierarchy as such creates a pecking order, where it is impossible to express real and sincere feelings. The respect for authorities and the virtue of obedience are legitimized through education, culture and religion.

The male child is the primary object of militaristic education. He is educated to be obedient, competitive, self-sacrificing and respectful towards authorities, and at the same time a boy must have a desire for power and an aspiration to oppress others, even with coercive means. In the education of boys is fulfilled the idea that weakness, uncertainty and sentimentality are the qualities of girls. Gentleness, affection and sentimentality are relegated to women. According to Pacheco (1987) there is a strong paranoia between sexes. She writes that women are in the habit of analyzing their situation in terms of "a male-oriented society", "a society of male values", "male economics" and similar labels that indicate that they view the question of sex as the cause of their problems. At the same time they fail to see the the majority of men are equally enslaved by socioeconomic power (ibid, p. 64).

Power is either covertly or openly in the possession of an economic-military alliance. Many politicians function merely as marionettes of the militaristic power system. The studies of Scilla McClean (1986) on the decision-making process concerning nuclear weapons show that the war industry obliges politicians to follow its orders. In reality the opinions of voters come second. Power defines what is important in society and what is less important and what issues are regarded as problems. The influence of power ranges from the definition of problems to the measures taken to solve them. Only when the power system is revealed does the criticizing of it become possible.

Environmental problems are also defined through the prism of social power. For example, it is a scientific fact that private cars are the worst pollutants of cities, but which solution should be chosen, the development of mass transportation or the installing of catalyzers? If the latter alternative is chosen the solving of the problem is only postponed.

Power also defines what social development is. The maintenance of economic growth is regarded as development, even though this ideology should be weighed critically. If a military-political power system expresses a concern that the state does not have enough weapons, this concern soon becomes a social problem. Supported by the mass media, the military political power system teaches the people that it is necessary to acquire and replace weapons.

In militarism power is always hierarchical, it is power over others and power to oppress others. This type of power leads to power struggles and competition. It is the core of the patriarchal exercise of power. Violence is idealized, because it is the extreme form of the power struggle, which is the central feature of patriarchy. Violence is supported by hero-worship or it is provided in the form of entertainment through mass media over and over again. Entertainment based on violence contributes to the legitimizing of the use of violence in solving problems. Competition is regarded as an essential feature of culture, as an intrinsic part of the human race, and it is legitimized in all sectors of the society from the arts to sports, from schooling to the economy.

In militaristic cultures festivals underline the themes of struggle and battle. The values of a militaristic culture require that people participate in the power struggle, but there might simultaneously prevail a religious or ethical opinion, which emphasizes self-sacrifice and altruism. In this double bind a human being cannot do the right thing, and he feels guilty. When he steps

aside or is left aside from the power struggle he does not adhere to the militaristic values; he has failed and he suffers from guilt because of his unworthiness. But if he searches for his share of power, he sins according to his religion and his human ethics, and he is guilty again. In such cultures the feeling of guilt is one of the central problems in life.

The basic material of the myth, the idealization of mightiness and power, appears in all different aspects of culture, but we do not see the power of the myth and can not protect ourselves from it.

All those who possess nondemocratic power are deeply afraid of the consciousness of the people, of the moment they become fully aware of the injustice of the system in which they live. They are paranoid, selfish, corrupted, and they exploit everybody else in society and therefore they do not appreciate the human rights of minorities. The militaristic power system tries to conform everyone to the dominant culture.

Peace Education Challenges the Cultures of Militarism

Militaristic education and military training promote obedience, competition, discipline and systems where men learn to oppress each other. At present the teaching at school supports the militaristic culture by demanding obedience and belief in authority from pupils. The memorizing, repeating and reproducing of text have become the essence of learning at school. Getting to know reality means to learn what authorities have written about it. The text has taken the role of object in the learning process. This object is molded by pupils in a curious manner: the outcome of their activity is chiefly the same text reproduced and modified orally or in a written form. The reason for this reversal is the historical isolation of school from the rest of societal activities. Traditional teaching does not aim to educate people who can think independently and responsibly, but to classify pupils by exercises which require formal learning (Miettinen, 1990).

In militaristic cultures school education tries to conform pupils to be similar by using discipline and authoritarian methods. In military training the same conformation process is made by using power, violence, imprisonment and cruelty. The timetable is planned to conform everyone to act at the same time. In the army everyone must look as similar as possible, hair must be short, uniformed bodies should do the same practices at the same time and in the same manner (Foucault, 1975). In military training young men are

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AKE BJERSTEDT

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

SO 021 583

manipulated to neglect their individual needs, thoughts, values and emotions.

Critical Thinking - A Tool against Militarism

Peace education aims to develop reflective and critical and individual thinking. Reflective and critical thinking is important in various fields: in direct personal relationships, in vocational and professional relations, as part of the political involvement of the adult, and with regard to the influence of the mass media in shaping the perceptions of citizens today. Critical thinking is opting for the process whereby war can be eliminated as a means to solve international conflicts. Reflective and critical thinking becomes a productive and positive activity, where people are actively engaged in life. They can see themselves in a creative and recreative political life (Dijkstra, 1989, p. 8).

Peace education opposes all kinds of oppression and conformism and it gives a high appreciation to cultural minorities. Peace education involves humanistic attitudes and values. Peace and International Education is now considered to be an essential part of *ethical education* and the development of healthy *self-esteem* and *critical consciousness*.

Habermas (1981) differentiates three generic areas in which human interest generates knowledge. These areas are "knowledge constituitive" because they determine categories of what we interpret as knowledge. They also determine the mode of discovering knowledge and for establishing whether knowledge claims are warranted. Habermas (1981) suggests three primary cognitive interests - the technical, the practical and the emancipatory. It is no use here to explain the two first ones, but the promotion of emancipatory interests is important. To promote an *emancipatory interest* can be a basic skill to attain a critical, responsible and comprehensive thinking model. Emancipatory interest involves an interest in self-knowledge, that is the knowledge of self-reflection. Emancipation is from libidinal, institutional or environmental forces which limit our options and rational control over our lives but have been taken for granted as beyond human control. Insights gained through critical self-awareness are emancipatory in the sense that at least one can recognize the correct reasons for his or her problems. Peace and International Education introduces various pedagogical methods to increase self-esteem, critical consciousness and moral growth. The suitable methods are Freinet-pedagogy, experiential learning and cooperative learning and methods related to Freire's ideas (Wahlström, 1991).

Peace Education Creates New Images of the Human Being and of the World

The image of the human being in the militaristic culture is pessimistic and emphasizes the evilness and violence of the human being. This image is being questioned in peace education. A positive and humane image of the human being is introduced to replace the negative image. In peace education the human being is regarded as an intrinsically good and loving creature. Evil and violence are seen as the products of false beliefs, wrong attitudes and education (Keppe, 1988).

Militarism underlines the probability of war, "si vis pacem para bellum", whereas peace education emphasizes the vision of the world without war. The false belief that arms increase security is questioned. Peace education guides people to think what a better world than the present could be like. As Engeström (1990) has stated: "People face situations where they must engage in formulating what shall be a desirable culture". Societies move toward what they image.

Peace education should play an important role in helping people clarify their existing values and explore the implications of new values. Reflection and action, imagining and doing, are closely connected (Boulding, 1988, p. 154). Peace education creates a new kind of paradigm to perceive the world. In this perception humankind is experienced as a unity, people are seen as children of the same Mother Nature and one and the same universal life manifests itself in each individual human life. Human meaning has a cosmic meaning (Skolimowski, ibid.). While perceiving the world in a new way, the human being understands how important and enriching the diversity of the culture is and how all the creatures in the world have a value per se.

There is no place in this new image of the world for the patriarchal hierarchy and power structures or for the conformation of cultures. The aim of militaristic rule is to merge minority cultures into the dominant culture. In the culture of peace the preserving of each minority culture is important. Peace education provides an optimistic and realistic vision of the future, where solidarity among people and toward nature prevails.

The task of the human being is to understand that he is only one of the organisms in the complex and vulnerable ecosystem. He has to become aware of this basic bond between him and nature, and in this process peace education has an important role. The purpose of peace education is to develop an ability in people to act for their peace conviction. In the present world direct and

continuous action is required for the preservation of life.

Education for Non-Violence

Birgit Brock-Utne has mentioned (1990, p. 4): "Non-violent strategies call for creativity and inventiveness for the application of the feministic idea that means and ends should be identical." It is an important task for peace education to develop ideas and images and visions for non-violent solutions to world and national problems. Non-violence towards people and nature must become the sacred value of humankind and peace education is helping in this process.

Fatherhood and feeling strong and masculine while caring and nurturing is one of those neglected values of militaristic culture. One road to non-violence is to give maximum possibilities to men to experience fatherhood and nurturance. Peace education aims to create a new male culture, in which fatherhood is equal with motherhood. The possibility to take paternity leave after the birth of one's child exemplifies the emphasizing of the importance of fatherhood. Paternity leave is possible, e.g. in Sweden and Finland. We can talk about a new male culture, where such qualities as fatherliness, care, affection and sensitivity are included in normal and healthy masculinity. The violent, dominating and possessive macho male image propagated by a militaristic culture appears ridiculous and dangerous in the new male culture. In the culture which emphasizes fatherliness, affection and non-violence courage is the ability to find peaceful means to resolve conflicts. In the new male culture it is possible to take off the straitjacket of competition and winning without threatening healthy and self-confident masculinity.

Peace education includes, for example, the development of cooperative play and games in early childhood education and school education (Wahlström, 1988 and 1989). Peace games (new games) should be created to counterbalance violent and competitive games. Modern culture is overloaded by the games and play which have "losers and winners". This kind of tradition teaches us to see enemies and ourselves as losers or winners. Competition within school is emphasized by a battery of professional educators, counselling and testing officials who determine normal distributions and establish grading curves that condemn many students to mediocrity. Birgit Brock-Utne (1989) calls it structural violence built into the school system. Children learn violence at school. The authoritarian structure creates

violence. The teacher-and-book oriented teaching creates frustration and violence.

Militaristic culture emphasizes and idealizes violence. One of the tasks of peace education is to prove this idealization dangerous. Non-violence includes above all the ability to listen and to understand the view of the other(s). We can find peaceful means to solve the problems caused by war and structural violence only by trying to also understand and take into consideration the views of minorities and the oppressed.

It is essential to develop the ability of role-taking (to use our imagination to "walk in the other's moccasins"). Flavell (1968) has introduced a four-phased model, which illustrates the developing of role-taking ability. The four phases are:

a. existence - to observe that the other person has a different opinion
b. need - attempt to define the other person's different way of thinking
c. drawing a conclusion - the ability to define what a person's view is like
d. applying - the ability to utilize another person's different view for the changing of one's own attitude.

Thus, the role-taking ability also requires the ability to apply another person's views to one's own thinking and activity, which presupposes the respecting of him as an equal person. However, the different views and ways of thinking, which can be learned to perceive and define (entries a and b), are not sufficient for reaching the level of application. The reaching of that level requires in addition to the acquisition of information, experiences affecting one's emotions and the awakening of empathy. These feelings awake in activity. Peace education attempts to create situations where people can practice various roles. The contemplation of true moral problems and the practicing of conflicts in real situations develop the role-taking ability.

Peace education undertakes an enormous task when it challenges the authoritarian education tradition of the militaristic culture with a transformation process in which the educator and the one who is educated meet each other as equals respecting and listening to the views of one another. Through these experiences the human being learns to understand that there exist different views, and that his way of perceiving the world is only one among others. These experiences are needed to reach the highest level of moral development. Peace education educates to contemplate and evaluate one's own convictions and ethical principles, and to maintain continuous spiritual development.

From Militaristic Structures to Peace

Peace-blocking factors and militaristic structures can be changed into peace-promoting factors. This process can be described schematically (the scheme is partly based on the proposal of Jensen, 1990) as follows:

Peace education aims at *conversion*

from	*to*
cultures of militarism	cultures of peace
authoritarian education	democratic education
military training	disarmament education
propagation of prejudiced enemy images	counteracting prejudice
violent actions towards people and nature	non-violent actions towards people and nature
militaristic concepts, myths and images	alternative concepts, myths and images
neglecting fatherhood	promoting fatherhood
supporting sexism	supporting equality between men and women
obedience, uniformity	supporting self-reliance, independence and critical thinking
neglecting equality, justice and human rights	respecting equality, justice and human rights
racism and nationalism	tolerance and global responsibility

When the cultural set of values which idealizes competition and violence is replaced with more peaceful and humane values, one has to look for new attitudes and courage to support values which maintain life.

If peace education was regarded as a socially important and necessary activity, it would force the militaristic value and power structures to undergo a transformation. It is probably for this reason that peace education has been seen as dangerous.

Peace education creates a basis for the education of such people to whom it is not important to possess, win and rule, but to show and feel sympathy and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

to defend the weaker by non-violent means. As Galtung (1974) has said, an integral part of peace education is to listen carefully to the voice of even the most distant nations and people (ref. Kekkonen, 1986, p. 49).

The supporting of non-violence takes courage in a time when people promote their own interests by means of violence or power politics. Everyone who chooses non-violence and solidarity shows great civil courage. Peace education reminds people that real courage is needed every day to protect life and nature, and to oppose militarism. As Betty Reardon has written (1988, XV): "The whole of human society is faced with the challenge of making global policy choices that will determine whether or not our species will survive. Education must therefore face up to the need to prepare the young for global responsibility, to understand the nature and implications of global interdependence, and to accept the responsibility to work for a just, peaceful, and viable global community on planet Earth".

References

Anon. *The Encyclopedia Americana. International edition.* Vol. 19. New York: American Corporation, 1975.

Boulding, E. *Building a global civic culture: Education for an inter-dependent world.* New York: Teachers College Press, 1988.

Brock-Utne, B. *Education for peace.* New York: Pergamon Press, 1985.

Brock-Utne, B. *Feministic perspectives on peace and peace education.* New York: Pergamon Press, 1989.

Brock-Utne, B. Listen to women for a change. Paper presented in A meeting of the worlds. Joensuu, Finland. June 19-23. 1990.

Chilton, P. Nukespeak: Nuclear language, culture and propaganda. In: Aubrey, Crispin (Ed.). *Nukespeak: The media and the bomb.* London: Comedia Publishing Group, 1982. Pp. 94-112.

Dijkstra, P. Adult education for peace. *Convergence,* 1989, *22*(1), 5-9.

Easlea, B. *Fathering the unthinkable: Masculinity, scientists and the nuclear arms race.* London: Pluto Press, 1983.

Engeström, Y. Activity theory and individual and societal transformation. In: International Congress for Research on Activity Theory (ISCRAT). Lahti, Finland. 1990.

Flavell, J. H. *The development of role-taking and communication skills in children.* New York: Wiley, 1968.

French, M. *Beyond power: On women, men and morals*. London: Abacus, 1986.

Foucault, M. *Naissance de la prison*. Paris: Editions Gallimard, 1975.

Habermas, J. *Theorie des kommunikativen Handelns*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1981.

Häyrynen, Y.-P. Peace research in the field of psychology and pedagogy and their share in anti-war efforts. *Peace Newsletter*, 1985, *1*, 1-4.

Iglitzin, L. War, sex, sports and masculinity. In: L.L.Farran Jr. (Ed.) *War: A historical and social study*. New York: Liveright, 1978.

Jensen, J. P. Human rights and education for peace. Paper presented at the conference "Human Rights and Education for Peace", Madrid, March 5-7. 1990.

Kekkonen, H. Peace education for adults. In: *Adult education, development and peace*. Sri Lanka: National Association for Total Education (NATE), 1986.

Keppe, N.R. et al. *Liberation of the people - The pathology of power*. Sao Paolo: Proton Publishing House, 1988.

Lagerspetz, K.M.J. Are wars caused by aggression? Paper presented at the International Congress of Psychology. Acapulco, Mexico. 1984.

Lasswell, H. D. *Propaganda technique in the world war*. New York: Knopf, 1927.

Leakey, R. *The making of mankind*. London: Shema, 1981.

Luckham, R. Of arms and culture. *Current research on peace and violence* (Tampere Peace Research Institute), 1984, *7*(1), 1-64.

Lumsden, M. Militarism: Cultural dimensions of militarization. In: L. Herrera and R. Väyrynen (Eds.), *Peace, development and new international economic order*. Tampere: Vaasa, 1977. Pp. 54-60.

Luostarinen, H. *Perivihollinen* (The traditional enemy). Tampere: Vastapaino, 1986.

Luostarinen, H. Finnish Russophobia: The story of an enemy image. *Journal of Peace Research*, 1989, *26*, 123-137.

McLean, S. (Ed.). *How nuclear weapons decisions are made?* London: Macmillan Press, 1986.

Miettinen, R. Learning, curriculum practice and teacher's work. In: *International Congress for Research on Activity Theory* (ISCRAT). Lahti, Finland. 1990.

Pacheco, C.B. *Women on the couch: An analysis of the female psychopathology*. Sao Paolo: Proton Publishing House, 1987.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Rapaport, A. Introduction. In Clausewitz, C. *On war*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Classics, 1968. Pp. 11-80.

Reardon, B. *Sexism and the war system*. New York: Teachers College Press,1985.

Reardon, B. *Educating for global responsibility*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1988.

Skolimowski, J. The role of philosophy and values in the right model of peace. *International Journal of World Peace*, 1987, *5*, 3-39.

Volkan, V. The needs to have enemies and allies: A developmental approach. *Political Psychology*, 1985, *6*(2), 219-247.

Wahlström, R. On the psychological basis of peace education: Enemy image and development of moral judgement. Paper presented at the Eleventh Conference of IPRA, International Peace Research Association, Brighton, England, April 13-18, 1986.

Wahlström, R. Enemy image as a psychological antecedent of warfare. In: Ramirez, J. et al. (Eds.) *Essays on violence*. Sevilla: Publ. de La Universidad de Sevilla, 1987. Pp. 21-45.

Wahlström, R. Educating preschool children for shared responsibility and peace. *Reprints and Miniprints* (Malmö: School of Education), No. 590, 1988.

Wahlström, R. Enemy images and peace education. *Reprints and Miniprints* (Malmö: School of Education), No. 660, 1989.

Wahlström, R. *Growth towards peace and environmental responsibility*. (Publication Series B: Theory and Practice.) Jyväskylä: Institute for Educational Research. (In press, 1991.)

Øberg, J. *Myter om vor sikkerhed*. (Myths about our security.) Copenhagen: Mellemfolkeligt Samvirke, 1981.

Appendix 1: 'The Seville Statement on Violence'

"Believing that it is our responsibility to address from our particular disciplines the most dangerous and destructive activities of our species, violence and war; recognizing that science is a human cultural product which cannot be definitive or all encompassing; and gratefully acknowledging the support of the authorities of Seville and representatives of the Spanish UNESCO; we, the undersigned scholars from around the world and from relevant sciences, have met and arrived at the following Statement on Violence. In it, we challenge a number of alleged biological findings that have been used, even by some in our disciplines, to justify violence and war. Because the alleged findings have contributed to an atmosphere of pessimism in our time, we submit that the open, considered rejections of these mis-statements can contribute significantly to the International Year of Peace.

Misuse of scientific theories and data to justify violence and war is not new but has been made since the advent of modern science. For example, the theory of evolution has been used to justify not only war, but also genocide, colonialism, and suppression of the weak.

We state our position in the form of five propositions. We are aware that there are many other issues about violence and war that could be fruitfully addressed from the standpoint of our disciplines, but we restrict ourselves here to what we consider a most important first step.

IT IS SCIENTIFICALLY INCORRECT to say we have inherited a tendency to make war from our animal ancestors. Although fighting occurs widely throughout animal species, only a few cases of destructive intra-species fighting between organized groups have ever been reported among naturally living species, and none of these involve the use of tools designed to be weapons. Normal predatory feeding upon other species cannot be equated with intra-species violence. Warfare is a peculiarly human phenomenon and does not occur in other animals.

The fact that warfare has changed so radically over time indicates that it is a product of culture. Its biological connection is primarily through language which makes possible the co-ordination of groups, the transmission of technology, and the use of tools. War is biologically possible, but it is not inevitable, as evidenced by its variation in occurrence and nature over time and space. There are cultures which have not engaged in war for centuries, and there are cultures which have engaged in war frequently at some times and not at others.

IT IS SCIENTIFICALLY INCORRECT to say that war or any other violent behaviour is genetically programmed into our human nature. While genes are involved at all levels of nervous system function, they provide a developmental potential that can be actualized only in conjunction with the ecological and social environment. While individuals vary in their predispositions to be affected by their experience, it is the interaction between their genetic endowment and conditions of nurturance that determines their

personalities. Except for rare pathologies, the genes do not produce individuals necessarily predisposed to violence. Neither do they determine the opposite. While genes are co-involved in establishing our behavioural capacities, they do not by themselves specify the outcome.

IT IS SCIENTIFICALLY INCORRECT to say that in the course of human evolution there has been a selection for aggressive behaviour more than for other kinds of behaviour. In all well-studied species, status within the group is achieved by the ability to co-operate and to fulfill social functions relevant to the structure of that group. 'Dominance' involves social bondings and affiliations: it is not simply a matter of the possession and use of superior physical power, although it does involve aggressive behaviours. Where genetic selection for aggressive behaviour has been artificially instituted in animals, it has rapidly succeeded in producing hyper-aggressive individuals; this indicates that aggression was not maximally selected under natural conditions. When such experimentally-created hyper-aggressive animals are present in a social group, they either disrupt its social structure or are driven out. Violence is neither in our evolutionary legacy nor in our genes.

IT IS SCIENTIFICALLY INCORRECT to say that human have a 'violent brain'. While we do have the neural apparatus to act violently, it is not automatically activated by internal or external stimuli. Like higher primates and unlike other animals, our higher neutral processes filter such stimuli before they can be acted upon. How we act is shaped by how we have been conditioned and socialized. There is nothing in our neurophysiology that compels us to react violently.

IT IS SCIENTIFICALLY INCORRECT to say that war is caused by 'instinct' or any single motivation. The emergence of modern warfare has been a journey from the primacy of emotional and motivational factors, sometimes called 'instincts', to the primacy of cognitive factors. Modern war involves institutional use of personal characteristics such as obedience, suggestibility, and idealism, social skills such as language, and rational considerations such as cost-calculation, planning, and information processing. The technology of modern war has exaggerated traits associated with violence both in the training of actual combatants and in the preparation of support for war in the general population. As a result of this exaggeration, such traits are often mistaken to be the causes rather than the consequences of the process.

We conclude that biology does not condemn humanity to war, and that humanity can be freed from the bondage of biological pessimism and empowered with confidence to undertake the transformative tasks needed in this International Year of Peace and in the years to come. Although these tasks are mainly institutional and collective, they also rest upon the consciousness of individual participants for whom pessimism and optimism are crucial factors. Just as 'wars begin in the minds of men', peace also begins in our minds. The same species who invented war is capable of inventing peace. The responsibility lies with each of us."

Contributors to 'The Seville Statement on Violence':

David Adams. Psychology. Wesleyan University, Middletown, CT 06457, USA.

S. A. Barnett. Ethology. The Australian National University, Canberra, Australia.

N. P. Bechtereva. Neurophysiology. Institute for Experimental Medicine of Academy of Medical Sciences of USSR, Leningrad, USSR.

Bonnie Frank Carter. Psychology. Albert Einstein Medical Center, Philadelphia (PA), USA.

José M. Rodriguez Delgado. Neurophysiology. Centro de Estudios Neurobiologicos, Madrid, Spain.

José Luis Diaz. Ethology. Instituto Mexicano de Psiquiatria, Mexico D. F., Mexico.

Andrzej Eliasz. Individual Differences Psychology. Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland.

Santiago Genovés. Biological Anthropology. Instituto de Estudias Antropologicos, Mexico D. F., Mexico.

Benson E. Ginsburg. Behaviour Genetics. University of Connecticut, Storrs (CT), USA.

Jo Groebel. Social Psychology. Erziehungswissenschaftliche Hochschule, Landau, Federal Republic of Germany.

Samir-Kumar Ghosh. Sociology. Indian Institute of Human Sciences, Calcutta, India.

Robert Hinde. Animal Behaviour. Cambridge University, UK.

Richard E. Leakey. Physical Anthropology. National Museums of Kenya, Nairobi, Kenya.

Taha H. Malasi. Psychiatry. Kuwait University, Kuwait.

J. Martin Ramirez. Psychobiology. Universidad de Sevilla, Spain.

Federico Mayor Zaragoza. Biochemistry. Universidad Autonoma, Madrid, Spain.

Diana L. Mendoza. Ethology. Universidad de Sevilla, Spain

Ashis Nandy. Political Psychology. Center for the Study of Developing Societies, Delhi, India.

John Paul Scott. Animal Behaviour. Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green (OH), USA.

Riitta Wahlström. Psychology. University of Jyväskylä, Finland.

"Peace Education Miniprints" are published and distributed by the R&D Group "Preparedness for Peace" (address: School of Education, Box 23501, S-200 45 Malmö, Sweden.)

At present "Peace Education Miniprints" will also function as aids in the networking activities of PEC/IPRA (the Peace Education Commission of the International Peace Research Association).

ISSN 1101-6418

BEST COPY AVAILABLE